

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT TACOMA

10 CRAIG WEIGHALL,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 LT. PEA, *et al.*

14 Defendants.

15 Case No. 06-5663 RBL/KLS

16 ORDER DENYING SECOND
17 MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF
18 COUNSEL

19 Before the Court is Plaintiff's second motion for appointment of counsel. (Dkt. # 47).

20 Plaintiff's first motion for counsel (Dkt. # 8) was denied on January 12, 2007. (Dkt. # 11). Having
21 reviewed the present motion, the Court finds for the reasons stated below that Plaintiff's motion
22 should be denied.

23 I. DISCUSSION

24 There is no right to have counsel appointed in cases brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

25 Although the court, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d), can request counsel to represent a party proceeding
26 *in forma pauperis*, the court may do so only in exceptional circumstances. *Wilborn v. Escalderon*,
27 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986); *Franklin v. Murphy*, 745 F.2d 1221, 1236 (9th Cir. 1984);
28 *Aldabe v. Aldabe*, 616 F.2d 1089 (9th Cir. 1980). A finding of exceptional circumstances requires
an evaluation of both the likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the plaintiff to
articulate his claims *pro se* in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. *Wilborn*, 789
F.2d at 1331. Neither of these factors is dispositive and both must be viewed together before

29 ORDER - 1

1 reaching a decision on request of counsel under Section 1915(d). *Id.*

2 Plaintiff has demonstrated an adequate ability to articulate his claims *pro se* and has not
3 demonstrated that the issues involved in this case are complex or that he has had any difficulties in
4 expressing them. Plaintiff is articulate and brings his claims in a very clear and organized manner.
5 While Plaintiff may not have vast resources or legal training, he meets the threshold for a pro se
6 litigant.

7 Plaintiff has raised no new exceptional circumstances that were not addressed or considered
8 in his first motion. Accordingly, the Court continues to find that counsel is not necessary in this
9 case and Plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel (Dkt. # 47) is **DENIED**.

10 The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to Plaintiff and counsel for Defendants.
11

12 DATED this 26th day of March, 2008.



13
14
15 Karen L. Strombom
16 United States Magistrate Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28